UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/653,255	09/03/2003	Katsuhiko Matsusaka	009683-481	2789

21839 7590 03/18/2009

BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER	
HUSSAIN, TAUQIR	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2452	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/18/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/653,255	MATSUSAKA, KATSUHIKO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TAUQIR HUSSAIN	2452	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 December 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/11/2008*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to amendment /reconsideration filed on 12/29/2008, the amendment/reconsideration has been considered. Claims 1-17, 19 and 20 have been amended and claims 21-23 have been newly added, therefore claims 1-23 are pending for examination, the rejection cited as stated below.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d) (1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

5. Independent claims 1 recites, "...mail sent from said server by **altering the representation** of the folder tree structure .....with the **altered representation** of the folder tree structure...".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claim 1, 2, 4-15, 17 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillingham et al. (Patent No.: US 6327608 B1), hereinafter "Dillingham" in view of Berchtold et al (Patent No.: US 6678705 B1), hereinafter "Berchtold" and further in view of Miyamura et al (Pub. No.: US 2002/0191222 A1), hereinafter "Miyamura".

8. As to claim 1, 10 and 17, Dillingham discloses the core concept of document registration or upload, including, a first transmission portion sending an inquiry mail from a client to a server for inquiring about folder tree structure at the server (Dillingham, Fig.4, element-214, Abstract, where client sends a request to a server for file system object);

a second transmission portion at said server, transmitting a representation of the folder structure to said client in response to the inquiry sent from said client (Dillingham, Fig.4, element-228, Abstract, where server sends the directory/folder path or tree back to client);

a third transmission portion, at said client, designating a storage folder within the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from said server in the form of a reply sent from said server (Dillingham, Fig.5, Abstract, where client browse the directory in reply to server response);

Dillingham however is silent on disclosing explicitly, and sending mail to said server or a storage portion, at said server, storing the attached file in the storage folder as designated in the reply mail, in response to the reply mail sent from said client.

Berchtold however discloses, sending to said server with an attached file or a storage portion at said server (Berchtold, Fig.1, element-125, Abstract, where contents of the email is storage portion), storing the attached file in the storage folder as designated, in response to the mail sent from said client (Berchtold, Fig.1, element-125, Abstract, where contents of the email is storage portion and archiving is storing the file at the server).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dillingham with the teachings of Berchtold in order to provide an architecture for document archival built on network-centric groupware such as Internet standards-based messaging. Archiving and retrieving and classifying documents into meaningful collections is accomplished in a manner similar to sending email to recipients, retrieving messages from folders, and classifying messages into folder hierarchies.

Dillingham and Berchtold, however are silent on disclosing explicitly, altering the representation of the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from said server or a reply mail with the altered representation of the folder tree structure and an attached file to the server.

Miyamura however discloses a similar concept as, altering the representation of the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from said server (Miyamura, Fig.6-8,

[0004], where server assigns a temporary folder held by the web filing system) or a reply mail with the altered representation of the folder tree structure and an attached file to the server (Miyamura, Fig.9, [0008], where change of folder or file name takes place as displayed in Fig.9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dillingham and Berchtold with the teachings of Miyamura in order to provide a file generation apparatus that generates a file and registers it in a file posting apparatus, and allows a user to handle a registered file with good operability.

9. As to claims 2 and 15, Dillingham, Berchtold and Miyamura discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 and 10 above including, wherein said second transmission portion sends the representation of the folder structure to the client in text format (Dillingham, Fig.4, element-228, where client script is a text format), and when receiving the representation of the folder structure in text format, said third transmission portion designates a storage folder for storage of the attached file by quoting the text contained in the mail sent from said server (Dillingham, Fig.4, element-214, Col.2, lines 38-45, where new path is equivalent to quoting the text).

10. As to claims 4-5 and 11-12, Dillingham, Berchtold and Miyamura discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 and 10 above including, reply from server performs authentication by comparing client information described in the inquiry mail sent from the client with client information as registered (Berchtold, Col.8, lines 10-15,

where client is successfully authenticated and it is obvious that there has to be some mechanism to compare client information before authentication), and sends the folder tree structure by mail only to the client that is successfully authenticated (Berchtold, Col.8, lines 10-15, where it is obvious and well known also that server providing access to only authorized users).

11. As to claims 6 and 13, Dillingham, Berchtold and Miyamura discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 and 10 above including, wherein said second transmission portion sends character string of encrypted information indicative of a current log-in together with the representation of the folder tree structure when sending the representation of the folder tree structure to the client by mail (Dillingham, Drawing-4, Col.2, lines 46-50, where client request for new path is a string and can be interpret as request in real time and therefore can be equivalent to current log-in to an account).

12. As to claims 7 and 14, are rejected for the same rationale as applied to claim 4 and 5 above.

13. As to claim 8, Dillingham, Berchtold and Miyamura discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 above including, wherein said third transmission portion attaches and sends a plurality of file to one reply mail (Berchtold, Col.3, lines 15-20, where attached document is archived to the server and further is known in the art that more than one files can be attached and transmit via email).

14. As to claim 9, is rejected for the same rationale as applied to claim 3 and 8 above.

15. As to claim 21, Dillingham, Berchtold and Miyamura discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 above including, wherein said third transmission portion designates the storage folder by inserting a blank line below the storage folder in the representation of the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from said server, in the reply mail sent to said server (Berchtold, Claim 7, where similar function for designating the storage folder is disclosed by means for extracting a designated folder path in the hierarchy from an electronic mail).

16. As to claim 22, carry similar limitation as claim 21 above and therefore is rejected under for same rationale.

17. As to claim 23, in addition to the rejection of claims 21-22, Dillingham, Berchtold and Miyamura discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 above including, for each of the plurality of attached files, a respective numerical character corresponding to an order in which the attached files are identified in the reply email, below a representation of a respective one of the plurality of files in which the attached files are to be stored (Berchtold, Col.10, lines 13-23, where index structure storing both string and numerical attributes for file and folder retrieval)

18. Claim 3, 16 and 18-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillingham, Berchtold and Miyamura as applied above in view of Mutton et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0147840 A1), hereinafter "Mutton".

19. As to claims 3 and 16, Dillingham, Berchtold and Miyamura discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 and 10 above including, wherein said second transmission portion sends the representation of the folder structure to the client (Dillingham, Fig.4, elelment-228, where client script is a text folder path).

Dillingham and Berchtold however, are silent on using HTML format to point to directory structure and when receiving the folder structure in HTML format, said third transmission portion designates a storage folder by clicking the storage folder.

However, Mutton discloses, sending the directory structure in HTML format (Mutton, [0072], where hyperlink to the file structure is embedded in email) and said third transmission portion designates a storage folder by clicking the storage folder (Mutton, [0039], where hyperlinks are used to direct the link to appropriate/designated file location).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dillingham, Berchtold and Miyamura as applied to parent claims 1 and 10 above with the teachings of Mutton in order to provide a software for constructing option encoding reference tags for the link servers, thus eliminating the need to learn formal request requirements of the link server.

20. As to claims 18 and 20, Dillingham, Berchtold, Miyamura and Mutton discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 17 above, including, wherein processing is changed in accordance with a title of a mail sent from the client (Mutton, [0022], where link referral system including a classification arrangement for classifying web pages which system process are disclosed).

21. As to claim 19, is rejected for the same rationale applied to parent claim 17 above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAUQIR HUSSAIN whose telephone number is (571)270-1247. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571 272 3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2452

/Kenny S Lin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452